28th December 1956]

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: (a) & (b) A statement [a] is laid on the table of the House.

SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHI: From the statement it is found that persons with L.M.E. or L.E.E. qualification with not less than three years' workshop experience or teaching experience are given a scale of pay whose minimum and maximum respectively are Rs. 100 and Rs. 220 in Government schools and Rs. 100 and Rs. 200 in non-Government schools, whereas persons with the same (L.M.E. or L.E.E.) qualification with a minimum of one year's practical experience in engineering workshops or as Instructor in a recognized technical school are given a scale of pay whose minimum and maximum respectively are Rs. 85 and Rs. 175 in Government schools and Rs. 75 and Rs. 145 in non-Government schools. As there is a grievance that persons holding the same qualifications are given different scales of pay, may I know whether the Government will be pleased to make the scale uniform, and give a higher start in the same scale to persons with an experience of three years and more?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: The qualification for appointment as Instructor is a L.M.E. or L.E.E. Diploma with not less than three years' experience, and the scale of pay for the post is Rs. 100—5—120—10—220 in Government schools and Rs. 120—10—200 in non-Government schools. If a person with this experience is not available, then a person with a lesser experience is appointed, and in his case we have fixed the pay at Rs. 90 or Rs. 95. I do not think there has been any difficulty in adopting these scales of pay.

SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHI: From the last paragraph of the statement placed on the table of the House we find that men of the same qualifications—L.M.E. and L.E.E.—are started in the scale of Rs. 85—5—120—10—175. There is a grievance that the qualifications for both are the same and that there is difference in pay scales. Therefore, will the Government consider the redressal of this grievance by placing them on a uniform scale of pay, namely, Rs. 100 to Rs. 220 and giving a higher start to men of three years' experience? 10-10 a.m.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: One is the Senior Instructor and the other is the Assistant Instructor. Therefore, we have framed different scales. Whether both the posts could be combined is a question, I am afraid, which requires a little more consideration.

Pensioners of ex-Pudukkottah State

* 134 *Q.*—SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance and Education be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the rates of temporary increase in pensions allowed to the pensioners of ex-Pudukkottah State differ from these allowed to the other pensioners of this State;

[a] Printed as Appendix I on page 431 infra.

[28th December 1956

(*b*) whether it is a fact that ex-Pudukkottah State pensioners are allowed to draw at the Pudukkottah rates, if advantageous to them;

(*c*) whether in 1955 the Government received from teacher-pensioners complaints against payment of temporary increase in pensions at Madras rates; and

(*d*) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : (*a*) *to* (*d*) There are differences between the Pudukkottah and Madras rates of temporary increase in pensions as shown below :—

	Pudukkottai rates. per mensem. RS.		*Madras rates. per mensem.* RS.
Pensioners drawing a pension of Rs. 30 per mensem or less.	5	Pensioner drawing a pension not exceeding Rs. 20 per mensem.	4
Pensioners drawing a pension exceeding Rs. 30 but not exceeding Rs. 35 per mensem.	Such amount of temporary increase that will make the total Rs. 35 per mensem.	Pensioners drawing a pension exceeding Rs. 20 per mensem but not exceeding Rs. 60 per mensem.	5
Pensioners drawing a pension of Rs. 35 per mensem and above.	Nil.	Pensioners drawing a pension exceeding Rs. 60 per mensem but not exceeding Rs. 100 per mensem (with marginal adjustment up to Rs. 106 per mensem).	6

The Pudukkottai State employees who retired on or after the date of merger were permitted to draw temporary increase in pension at Madras rates or Pudukkottai rates, whichever were advantageous to them, with effect from 3rd February 1954. This privilege has been extended from 11th August 1955 to the ex-Pudukkottai State employees who retired even before the date of merger. In 1955, a Pudukkottai pensioner requested that the above orders might be given effect to from the date of his retirement in 1948. His request was not complied with, as financial concessions are not given with retrospective effect and as compliance with the request would be a departure from the established policy.

SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHI : Sir, it is not a question of giving retrospective effect to the claims of such of those as are not given the advantageous temporary increase at Pudukkottai rates. It is a question of fulfilment of the assurance given at the time of the merger that they would not be placed at a disadvantage. Will the Government consider this question not as one of giving retrospective effect to the Government Order passed by them but as a claim to which the pensioner is entitled and give him the amount of Rs. 35 or Rs. 40 to which he is entitled?

28th December 1956]

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I am afraid a policy decision has been taken, and I do not think there is a case for reconsideration of the matter.

Removal of untouchability

* 135 *Q.*—SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments and Transport be pleased to state—

(*a*) the amount of special grant made by the Central Government for expenditure on schemes for the " removal of untouchability " in the State during the years (i) 1954–55, (ii) 1955–56 and (iii) 1956–57; and

(*b*) the specific purposes for which the amounts were utilized?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN :

(*a*) (i) 1954–55—Rs. 38,000.

(ii) 1955–56—Rs. 1,71,816.

(iii) 1956–57—Sanction of the Government of India is awaited.

(*b*) A statement is placed on the table of the House.

SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : Sir, with reference to item 4 under Publicity in the statement placed on the table of the House, may I know whether it is not a fact that some of these posters were found to be objectionable and whether the posting of these posters has been given up? May I also ask the Government to ensure proper scrutiny of such propaganda material before it is placed before the public?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : Sir, the poster that the hon. Member refers to is the poster the printing of which is undertaken by the Director of Harijan Welfare. We have now entrusted the work to the Director of Information and Publicity. The Government will certainly scrutinize such of those posters as are printed and would be posted.

SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : Sir, have tenders been invited for the printing of these posters? There was some allegation that the rules relating to tenders and contracts had not been properly observed in this case.

SRI V. CHAKKARAI CHETTY : Although I am putting a simple question now, it may require an elaborate answer from the Hon. Minister. The Government have taken many steps to improve the status of the Harijans and the backward communities. May I ask the Hon. Minister to let us know the progress that has been made in the direction of removing untouchability and raising the

* Printed as Appendix II on pages 432–433 infra.